

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is in response to the Official Action mailed on October 20, 2006. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10. Claims 1, 3-10 and 10-18 as amended remain pending in this application.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the above-identified application and in light of the remarks that follow are respectfully requested. Because the present claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the newly-cited combination of prior art, including the newly-cited Kassatly reference, it is submitted that good and sufficient cause exists for the entry for this amendment in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.116.

In the Official Action, the Examiner has maintained the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,470,497 to Ellis et al. ("Ellis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,169 to Okuyama ("Okuyama"), both previously cited, in further view of newly-cited U.S. Patent No. 6,493,878 to Kassatly ("Kassatly"). Applicant submits the claims, as amended, are not rendered obvious by the purported combination of these three references.

The Examiner has taken a broad reading of the claimed "additional information" and the "first and second insertion signals" generated therefrom, and cites to Fig. 5A of Ellis as disclosing the generation of first and second insertion signals from the additional information. Ellis, however, relates to a channel scanning mode (FLIP mode) that displays program information as each next or previous channel is automatically tuned to. The data used for display can be provided by a dedicated channel or can be embedded in the vertical blanking interval. (See Ellis, Col. 4 1.60 to Col. 5 1.16.) Ellis does not disclose multiplexing the program information on the main

information signals, nor does Ellis disclose superimposing *copyright protection related information* on the main information signals. The Examiner admits that Ellis lacks time division multiplexing and cites Okuyama for this purpose.

The Examiner relies on Okuyama for teaching multiplexing first and second information signals that are superimposed on the main signal, citing Figures 4-7. The Examiner states this superimposing allows for better quality of viewing and recording. This reasoning, however, has no relation to the claimed invention, which relates to superimposing *copyright related information, using two different encoding methods*, to prevent unauthorized reproduction and to allow different systems that have different decoding formats to decode at least one of the two insertion signals.

Okuyama discloses multiplexing Selection Information Table (SIT) data, which includes Event Information Table (EIT), i.e., Electronic Program Guide (EPG) data, onto the main information signals (image and voice data). (See Okuyama Col. 1 ll.19-61.) Okuyama is concerned with demultiplexing a selected data stream based on user selection from an EPG and then supplying the data stream and guide information to a recording/reproducing unit (VTR) such that guide data of the recorded program(s) can be displayed upon playback. Like Ellis, Okuyama does not disclose superimposing *copyright protection related information* on the main information signals.

Moreover, neither Ellis nor Okuyama disclose generating first and second insertion signals from the additional information using *two different encoding methods*.

Finally, the Examiner relies on Kassatly merely for TV channel transmission of compressed packets that can be transmitted via time-division multiplexing. (See Kassatly Figs. 1, 4; Col. 28 ll. 48-61.)

Thus, the combination of the cited prior art references by the Examiner does not disclose, teach or suggest the invention as presently claimed, which now clarifies the "additional information" and how the first and second insertion signals differ from one another as shown in the amended claims.

Because the combination of Ellis and Okuyama fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed means or method for multiplexing as now provided in independent claims 1 and 10, and thus the claims that depend therefrom, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently presented claims are patentable over the cited references and requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By


Jonathan A. David

Registration No.: 36,494
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant